

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 10-13 and 16-17 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied reference and to correct punctuation. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 16-17 are further amended to recite that the instruction form indicates processing to be executed by a plurality of instruction form execution apparatus. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 6, lines 25-26 of the specification as filed and in Figs. 1 and 4. Claims 1-7 and 13 also are amended to recite that the output information is "identification information". Support for this amendment can be found at, for example, page 9, lines 16-20. As disclosed, identification information is information about the instruction form such as instruction form names and locations and names of instruction form apparatus holding instruction forms. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Patel during the March 5, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied Reference**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0001217 to Wu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Regarding independent claims 1, 10-13 and 16-17, Wu fails to disclose (1) "wherein the instruction form is generated in advance" (claims 1, 10-13 and 16-17); (2) "the instruction form ... indicates a plurality of processing to be executed by a plurality of instruction form execution apparatus" (claims 1, 11, 13 and 16-17); (3) "[the instruction form] is different than any file to be processed by the instructions" (claims 1, 10-13 and 16-17); (4) "a retrieval part that retrieves the instruction form accessible to the user from the instruction form management apparatus based on the received information on the user" (claims 1, 10, 16, and

similarly recited in claim 13); (5) "an output part that outputs identification information on the retrieved instruction form to allow the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form to one or more instruction form execution apparatuses" (claims 1, 10, and similarly recited in claim 13); and (6) "an attachment part that attaches a portable storage medium which is unique to and capable of being carried by a predetermined user" (claims 11-12) or "an attachment part that attaches a storage medium that stores at least one selectable instruction form that includes processing instructions associated with a user" (claim 17).

Wu discloses a system to allow a user to print a document 94 from a mobile device such as a web cell phone 76 (Fig. 2). In operation, when a user checks into a hotel, the user provides his or her "Internet credentials" to the hotel (paragraph [0023]). Thereafter, the user can print document 94 that is stored in web storage 90 by using the web cell phone 76 to connect to the Internet, and to access web page 88 of web site 86 (*id.*). The user uses web page 88 to enter information regarding the print job, such as the location of the document 94, the number of copies, whether to staple, etc. in a print request 96 (*id.*). The print service 70 retrieves document 94 based on the submitted information and the user's Internet credentials (paragraph [0026]) and causes the document 94 to be printed.

Wu fails to disclose features (1) and (4) quoted above because Wu discloses only that the user initiates printing by creating print request 96 that is sent to print service 70 to initiate printing of document 94. Thus, print request 96 is not generated in advance and cannot be retrieved "based on the received information on the user" because the user creates the print request 96 at the time of printing. During the personal interview, Examiner Patel indicated that, in his view, Wu's document 94 corresponds to the claimed instruction form. However, document 94 does not disclose or suggest the claimed instruction form as discussed below.

Wu fails to disclose or suggest feature (2) quoted above because Wu discloses the printing of document 94 on a single printer. Further, Wu does not disclose that document 94,

itself, contains instructions on which printer it is to be printed. Thus, Wu's document 94 does not correspond to the claimed instruction form that "indicates a plurality of processing to be executed by a plurality of instruction form execution apparatuses" (claims 1, 11, 13 and 16-17), as claimed.

Wu fails to disclose or suggest feature (3) quoted above because, while Examiner Patel interprets Wu's document 94 as corresponding to the claimed instruction form, document 94 is the document printed (i.e., processed) in the system of Wu. Thus, Wu fails to disclose the claimed instruction form that is different than any file to be processed.

Wu fails to disclose or suggest feature (5) quoted above because Wu does not disclose outputting identification information on an instruction form (document 94 in Examiner Patel's interpretation) that allows the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form. During the personal interview, Examiner Patel indicated that the print request corresponded to the output part (or is produced by the output part) because it outputs (or includes) the URL of document 94. However, Wu's print request is input by the user into the system of Wu. The print request in Wu is not produced by the system of Wu. Thus, Wu does not disclose an "output part that outputs identification information on the retrieved instruction form [previously created for the user] to allow the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form" (comment and emphasis added), as claimed. Further, the claimed retrieved information allows a user to instruct processing, i.e., the output identification information comes before and is used by the user to instruct processing. However, in Wu, the user issues the print request. Thus, Wu's print request does not come before any instructing of processing by the user.

Wu fails to disclose feature (6) quoted above because Wu does not disclose that a user can store an instruction form on a portable storage medium that includes processing

instructions associated with a user or that such a portable storage medium can be attached to Wu's system.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-12 and 14-15 are patentable for the same reasons as their base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose  
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/mcp

Attachment:  
Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

Date: April 17, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--